The Conversion of the Revolutionary Jew

by E. Michael Jones

On June 15, 2006, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States passed a resolution condemning the Gospels as “anti-Jewish” documents. Since the conclusion which the Episcopalians drew from their recognition of that fact was to censor the Scriptures, especially their liturgical use, by removing anything a Jew might find offensive, many Episcopalians concluded that this was the final apostasy in a long slide which began at the Lambeth conference of 1930 when that church approved the use of contraceptives. Whether it is or it isn’t is beyond our purview here. No matter what conclusions the Episcopalians draw from the fact, the statement that the Gospels are anti-Jewish is, beyond the shadow of a doubt, true. The only real question is why it took the Episcopalians two thousand years to wake up to this fact or why they didn’t draw what seems to be the more logical conclusion, namely, that if Episcopalians want to be faithful to the example of Jesus Christ, they must be anti-Jewish as

well.

The Episcopalians did not say that the Scriptures were anti-Semitic. If they had said that, the statement would have been false. Anti-Semitism is a relatively recent word. It was created in 1870 by a German by the name of Wilhelm Marr. It refers to race, and claims that Jews are hateful because of certain ineradicable biological characteristics. That idea led to Hitler, but the defeat of Hitler led to a re-definition of the word. Anti-Semitism now has an entirely different meaning. An anti-Semite used to be someone who didn't like Jews. Now it is someone whom the Jews don't like. No Christian can in good conscience be an anti-Semite, but every Christian, insofar as he is a Christian, must be anti-Jewish. In contemporary parlance the two terms are practically synonymous but their meanings are very different, and the distincition is deliberately obscured for political purposes.

On October 16, 2004 President Bush signed into law the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act, which establishes a special department within the U.S. State Department to monitor global anti-Semitism, reporting

annually to Congress. As one of the major steps in the implementation of
that law, Secretary of State Condaleeza Rice swore in Gregg Rickman as
head of the State Department's office of global anti-Semitism on May 22,
2006. Rickman had ties with both Jewish organizations and congress. He was
staff director for former Sen. Peter Fitzgerald (R-Ill.), and chairman of
the Republican Jewish Coalition. But his main qualification for the job
was the role he played in conjunction with Senator Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY)
in shaking down $2 billion from the Swiss banks during the late '90s.
"Gregg Rickman, working with Sen. D'Amato, is almost single-handedly the
one who uncovered the corruption and the immorality of the Swiss banks,"
is how William Daroff, vice president for public policy of the United
Jewish Communities, the umbrella body of North American Jewish
federations, and director of its Washington office put it. "That kind of
doggedness will serve him well in his new capacity, according to
representatives of groups that liaise between Washington and small,
vulnerable Jewish communities overseas."

Mr. Rickman will not have to define anti-Semitism. His state department

office has already done that for him. In its “Report on Global
Anti-Semitism” and its “Global Anti-Semitism Report,” the U.S. State
Department lists the following set of beliefs as anti-Semitic:

1) Any assertion “that the Jewish community controls government, the
media, international business and the financial world” is anti-Semitic.

2) ”Strong anti-Israel sentiment” is anti-Semitic.

3) ”Virulent criticism” of Israel’s leaders, past or present, is
anti-Semitic. According to the State Department, anti-Semitism occurs when
a swastika is portrayed in a cartoon decrying the behavior of a past or
present Zionist leader. Thus, a cartoon that includes a swastika to
criticize Ariel Sharon’s brutal 2002 invasion of the West Bank, raining
“hell-fire” missiles on hapless Palestinian men, women and children, is
anti-Semitic. Similarly, when the word “Zionazi” is used to describe
Sharon’s saturation bombing in Lebanon in 1982 (killing 17,500 innocent
refugees), it is also “anti-Semitic.”

4) Criticism of the Jewish religion or its religious leaders or literature
(especially the Talmud and Kabbalah) is anti-Semitic.

5) Criticism of the U.S. government and Congress for being under undue influence by the Jewish-Zionist community (including AIPAC) is anti-Semitic.

6) Criticism of the Jewish-Zionist community for promoting globalism (the "New World Order") is anti-Semitic.

7) Blaming Jewish leaders and their followers for inciting the Roman crucifixion of Christ is anti-Semitic.

8) Diminishing the "six million" figure of Holocaust victims is anti-Semitic.

9) Calling Israel a "racist" state is anti-Semitic.

10) Asserting that there exists a "Zionist Conspiracy" is anti-Semitic.

11) Claiming that Jews and their leaders created the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia is anti-Semitic.

12) Making "derogatory statements about Jewish persons" is anti-Semitic.

The State Department criteria has serious implications for anyone alive today. The most serious is that it turns many Jews, who have made many of

the above claims in books and articles they have written, into anti-Semites. But the State Departmen's definitions have serious historical implications as well. If we take numbers 4 and 7 for example, it seems clear that not just ordinary Catholics but Catholic popes and saints were guilty of anti-Semitism, according to the State Department's criteria. Numerous popes beginning with Pope Gregory IX in 1238 have condemned the Talmud as a blasphemous assault on the person of Christ and the Christian faith and have urged Christians to confiscate and burn it.

Concerning #7, St. Peter, the first pope claimed in the Acts of the Apostles that the Jews were responsible for the death of Christ. Even Nostrae Aetate, the declaration of Vatican II on the Jews which ushered in an era of good feeling and "ecumenism" claimed that some Jews were responsible for Christ's death. By their promiscuous use of the term anti-Semitism Rickman and his cohorts in the State Department have turned traditional Catholic teaching into a hate crime.

In spite of 40 years of Jewish exaggeration and chutzpah, certain facts remain. The Church is not and cannot possibly be anti-Semitic, because the

term refers primarily to race and racial hatred. The Church cannot promote racial hatred of any group, certainly not of the Jews because its founder was a member of that racial group. However, the Gospel of St. John makes clear that there is a deep and abiding Christian animus against the Jews who rejected Christ. This “Judenfeindlichkeit,” if we use Brumlik’s word, is part of the essence of Catholicism. The Church is hostile to “Jews” because they have defined themselves as rejecters of Christ. The Church is anti-Jewish, but unlike the Jews, who, as Rabbi Solveichik has explained in First Things, feel that hatred is a virtue, Christians are told to love their enemies. The “Jews” by which St. John means the Jews who rejected Christ, became by that fact Christians’ enemies, but all Jews had been transformed by the coming of Christ. They had to accept him as the Messiah or reject him. Those Jews who accepted Christ as the Messiah became known as Christians. Those Jews who rejected him became known as “Jews.”

And why did the Jews reject Christ? Because he was crucified. They wanted a powerful leader, not a suffering servant. The leaders of the Jews, Annas and Caiphas, representing all Jews who would reject Him,

told Christ that
if he came down from the cross, they would accept him as the Messiah.
Because they could not accept a Messiah who suffered and died instead of
restoring the kingdom as they wanted it restored, which is to say in
carnal fashion, the Jews who rejected Christ became revolutionaries. The
Jews who rejected Christ became revolutionaries at the foot of the cross,
but the full implication of their decision didn't become apparent until 30
years later, when the Jews rebelled against Rome, and Rome retaliated by
destroying the Temple. At this point, the Jews had no temple, no
priesthood and no sacrifice, and as a result they had no way of fulfilling
their covenant. Seeing which way the battle for Jerusalem was going, a
rabbi by the name of Jochanan ben Zakkai had himself smuggled out of
Jerusalem in a shroud, and after being recognized as a friend of Rome was
granted the privilege of founding a rabbinical school at Javne.

It is at this moment, 30 some years after the founding of the Church, that
modern Judaism, Judaism as we know it, was born. The Jews were no longer
the children of Moses performing certain rituals in fulfillment of their

covenant. Judaism had become essentially a debating society, because in the absence of a Temple, that was all the Jews could do. The results of these interminable debates became known as the Talmud, which got written down over the next six centuries.

The debating did nothing to eradicate the spirit of revolution from the Jews. In many ways, it intensified it by teaching the Jews to look for a military Messiah. The Jews got their military Messiah roughly 60 years after the destruction of the Temple, when Simon bar Kokhbar rose up against Rome in 136. All of the rabbis in Jerusalem recognized bar Kokhbar as the Messiah, and as if to prove that racial Judaism had become meaningless, the Christian Jews were expelled for not recognizing him.

The expulsion of the Christian Jews at the time of Simon bar Kokhbar proved that the Jew was not a racial but a theological construct. The ultimate determinant of Jewishness had become rejection of Christ, and that rejection led inexorably to revolution. When they rejected Christ Jews became revolutionaries. For the past 2000 years, history has been a struggle between the spiritual descendents of two groups

of Jews: those
who accepted Jesus Christ as the Messiah and those who rejected him.
History became, in some sense an intra-Jewish struggle at the foot of the
cross.

In the fall of 2003, Mahathir Mohammed, prime minister of Malaysia,
announced that “The Jews rule the world by proxy. They get others to fight
and die for them.” Mahathir was immediately denounced as an anti-Semite
and accused of making “an absolute invitation for more hate crimes and
terrorism against Jews” in spite of the fact that he had said no such
thing and in spite of the fact that many Jews agreed with him. Henry Makow
felt that Mahathir’s speech “opposed terrorism.” Another Jew, who agreed
with Makow that Mahathir wasn’t a terrorist, had something similar to say.
Elias Davidson, a native of Jerusalem, feels that Jews do rule the world
by proxy. He goes on to explain how:

As a Jew myself (but opposed to Zionism) I need no encouragement from
Malaysian PM Mahathir Mohammed to observe what should be obvious to the
blatant eye: Namely that Jews effectively rule US foreign policy and thus
determine to a great extent the conduct of most countries. .

. . So it is
with the proposition that Jews control the world. Surely they do not
control every single action; surely it does not mean that every Jew
participates in the “control.” But for all practical purposes the
proposition holds.

What distinguishes a Jew like Davidson from a Jew like, say, Stanley Fish
is obviously not his ethnicity. It is not even his politics. What
distinguishes them is their divergent forms of literary criticism.
Davidson believes in the objectivity of statements. He holds the Malaysian
Prime Minister to what he actually said and, as a result, finds nothing
anti-Semitic in his statement. “Mahathir,” Davidson continues,

has neither asked to discriminate against Jews, let alone to kill Jews. It
is shameful to equate him to the Hitlerites. He urges Muslims to fight
Jews by adopting modern methods, technology and educate themselves, in
other words to surpass Jews in excellence. What’s wrong with that? By this
he is doing service to the Muslims (over 1 billion people) and to
humanity. Jews must know their place and content themselves with influence

derived from their small number. Jews must learn some humility... .

The Jews, if by that we mean the cabal that rules the Jews under the name of the Sanhedrin, the Kahal, the politburo or the ADL or the other major Jewish organizations, has had centuries of experience in dealing with Jews like Makow and Davidson. The modus operandi of Jewish leaders working over Jews who disagree with their leadership goes all the way back to the beginning of modern Judaism, which is to say, to the time of Christ, when, according to the Gospel of St. John, the parents of the man born blind refused to speak “out of fear of the Jews, who had already agreed to expel from the synagogue anyone who should acknowledge Jesus as the Christ.” Any Jew who chooses Logos—in any of its forms— over Talmud, which is to say the anti-Christian ideology confected by Jewish leaders to keep their people in bondage, will feel the ire of organized Jewry. Spinoza felt it in Amsterdam in the 17th century; in our day Norman Finkelstein has felt it as well. Since it sounds more than a little preposterous to call Jews who disagree with other Jews anti-Semites, the modern day Kahal has come up with a new term. Jews who disagree with the latter day

Kahal are called
“self-hating Jews” as they are being expelled from the modern day
synagogue of acceptable speech.

The Kahal was the autonomous legal system which the Jews established in
Poland to take care of their own legal affairs. The spirit which informed
that legal body was the Talmud. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, the
Talmud is “the supreme authority in religion . . . for the majority of
Jews.” The Talmud is a “systematic deformation of the Bible” in which “The
pride of race with the idea of universal domination is therein exalted to
the height of folly. . .. the Ten Commandments are not of obligation in
their regard.. . . With regard to the Goim (non-Jews) everything is
allowed: robbery, fraud, perjury, murder. . . .” Whenever its contents
were made known, Christians have condemned the Talmud as incompatible with
any rational social order. Jewish converts to Catholicism from the time of
Nicholas Donin onward have condemned the Talmud as well. Numerous popes
have condemned the Talmud because it was a direct assault on both the
divinity of Christ and the moral law as handed down by Moses. According to
the ex-Rabbi Drach, “the Talmud expressly forbids a Jew to

save a non-Jew
from death or to restore to him his lost possessions, etc, or to take pity
on him."

The Talmud was created to keep Jews in bondage to Jewish leaders by
prohibiting all contact with Logos, whether that is understood as the
person of Christ or the Truth or reasoning based on true principles and
logic. Taught to deceive by the Talmud, the Jews end up deceiving
themselves and playing into the hands of the leaders who manipulate them
for their own ends.

The Talmud has led to revolution. You don't have to be religious to be
talmudic. Karl Marx was an atheist, but according to Bernard Lazare, he
was also "a clear and lucid Talmudist," and, therefore, "full of that old
Hebrew materialism which ever dreams of a paradise on earth and always
rejects the far-distant and problematical hope of a garden of Eden after
death." (p. 99). Marx was the quintessential Talmudist and the
quintessential Jewish revolutionary, and as such he proposed one of the
most influential false Messiahs in Jewish history: world communism. Baruch
Levy, one of Marx's correspondents, proposed another

equally potent false
Messiah, namely, the Jewish Race. According to Levy,

> the Jewish people taken collectively shall be its own Messias. . . . In this new organization of humanity, the sons of Israel now scattered over the whole surface of the globe . . . shall everywhere become the ruling element without opposition . . . The governments of the nations forming the Universal or World -Republic shall all thus pass, without any effort, into Jewish hands thanks to the victory of the proletariat. . . . Thus shall the promise of the Talmud be fulfilled, that, when the Messianic epoch shall have arrived, the Jews will control the wealth of all the nations of the earth.

So, it turns out that there was basis in Jewish history for what Mahathir Mohammed said, as well as ample evidence—the creation of the state of Israel, for instance—that world Jewry had advanced considerably toward its goal of world domination in the century and a half since Levy wrote to Karl Marx.

The Jews, quite simply, could not shake themselves loose from the notion that they were God's chosen people, not even after they stopped believing in God. By rejecting Christ, they condemned themselves to

worship one
false Messiah after another—most recently Communism and Zionism. In their
book *La Question du Messie*, the Lemann brothers, both of whom converted
from Judaism to Catholicism, and both of whom became priests, compared
present day Jews to the Israelites at the foot of Mount Sinai: "having
grown weary of waiting for the return of Moses . . . they feasted and
danced around the golden calf." Zionism and Communism are two of the most
recent false Messiahs which the Jews have fallen down to worship. Having
rejected the supernatural Messiah who died on the cross, the Jews
condemned themselves to worship one false natural Messiah after another
and repeat the cycle of enthusiasm leading to disillusionment over and
over again throughout their history. Those illusions both found
fulfillment in and lent themselves to the creation of the birth of the
Jewish state. On January 6, 1948, the chief rabbi of Palestine announced
that ""Eventually it [Israel] will lead to the inauguration of the true
union of the nations, through which will be fulfilled the eternal message
to mankind of our immortal prophets." In the history of Jewish messianism,
fantasies of racial superiority alternate with contradictory

fantasies of
universal brotherhood. “The great ideal of Judaism,” The Jewish World
announced on February 9,1883 “is that . . .the whole world shall be
imbued with Jewish teaching and that in a Universal Brotherhood of
Nations—a greater Judaism in fact— all the separate races and religions
shall disappear” (p. 98).

The Jews were condemned to seek heaven on earth through false Messiahs
from the moment they chose Barabbas over Christ, a fact that leads to the
already mentioned cycle of enthusiasm followed by disillusionment. When
the Jews refused to be “heralds of a supernatural kingdom,” they condemned
themselves to the endless task of imposing their vision of a naturalistic
heaven on earth onto the world, “and they have put all their intense
energy and tenacity into the struggle for the organization of the future
Messianic Age.” Whenever a nation turns away from the Supernatural
Messiah, as was the case during the French and Russian revolutions, that
nation “will be pulled into the direction of subjection to the Natural
Messias” and end up being ruled by Jews.

Does that mean that every Jew is a bad person? No, it does

not. Jewish leadership controls the “synagogue of Satan,” which in turn controls the ethnic group into which Jews are born. No one has control over the circumstances of his birth. That is why anti-Semitism, if by that term we mean hatred of the Jews because of immutable and ineradicable racial characteristics, is wrong. Over the course of their lives, Jews come to understand that theirs is an ethnic group unlike any other. In spite of the propaganda of racial superiority which the Talmud seeks to inculcate in them, many Jews come to understand that a peculiarly malignant spirit has taken up its home at the heart of their ethnos. Once they become aware of the magnitude of that evil, Jews are faced with a choice. Depending on the disposition of the heart, which only God can judge, they either dedicate themselves to that evil or they reject it—completely as in the case of St. Paul, Nicholas Donin, Joseph Pfefferkorn and other Jews too numerous to mention—or inchoately, as in the case of the Jews of conscience who refuse to go along with something which they know is morally wrong, be that abortion or the eviction of Palestinians from their ancestral lands.

The purpose of the Talmud is to prevent defections from the synagogue of Satan. Behavior based on the Talmud naturally leads to resentment on the part of non-Jews. The leaders of the Jews promote that behavior knowing full well that it will cause reactions because “Pogroms in which the rank and file of the Jewish nation suffer serve the useful purpose of keeping them in absolute dependence on their leaders.” This is another way of saying that the Trotskys promote the revolution and the Braunsteins suffer for it. Jewish leaders promote pogroms, wittingly as the Gomeler Pogrom of 1905 or when Mossad agents deliberately killed Iraqi Jews to spread panic, because pogroms promote fear, and fear is the way the Kahal keeps ordinary Jews in line.

Alice Ollstein, Jewish high school student from Santa Monica, California, noticed this when she attended a recent policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Conference in Washington, DC in 2006. Miss Ollstein went as an enthusiastic Zionist but returned “feeling manipulated, disturbed and disgusted with a great deal of what I witnessed there” (http://www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?

id=15634).

What she witnessed was non-stop fear mongering. In fact the “first thing”
she noticed about the conference was “the carefully manufactured
atmosphere of fear and urgency.” The hall where the plenary sessions were
held

was always filled with dramatic classical music, red lighting and gigantic
signs reading “Now Is The Time.” That, combined with the montages of
terrorism footage projected onto six giant screens, whipped the audience
into a “Save Israel” fervor that most found inspiring. By the time we
finished our meal, the audience seemed eager to agree to anything that
would protect Israel— even war. . . . Each speaker played upon the
audience’s deepest fears. . . .

The Neoconservatives were in charge of the fear-mongering. In particular,
John Podhoretz, son of Norman and a columnist for The New York Post, “got
to have the first word and the last word on almost every question.”
Ollstein found the comparisons which AIPAC drew between Iranian President
Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hitler particularly manipulative.

To the tune of more dramatic classical music, the six enormous screens flashed back and forth between Hitler giving anti-Jew speeches and Ahmadinejad giving anti-Israel speeches. The famous post-Holocaust mantra "Never Again" popped up several times. Everything was geared toward persuading the audience that another Holocaust is evident ... unless we get them first.

Alice Ollstein resented "being forced to think" that the Prime Minister of Iran was "pure evil through clever sound bites and colorful images." She came away from the conference feeling manipulated by what Walt and Mearsheimer have characterized as the main agent of the Israel lobby in America. She is not the only Jew who feels this way. Zionism has reached the state of wretched excess that signals that a reaction is about to set in. Jewish disillusionment with the god that failed that was known as Communism came to be known as neoconservatism. The Jewish reaction to Zionism can be seen in the proliferation of "proud, self-hating Jews."

In response to a Danish magazine running a series of anti-Muslim cartoons

in March 2006, a group of Israelis organized an anti-Semitic cartoon contest. Gilad Atzmon, who described the contest on his web site, finds it only natural that “a few Jews who happen to be ethically motivated and talented enough to express themselves would raise their voices” in protest against what was fundamentally a black operation designed to get European countries so annoyed at the Muslim reaction to the cartoons that they would support a nuclear attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities. Atzmon claims that “the morally deteriorated conduct of the Jewish state and its supportive Jewish lobbies around the world” has engendered “a celebration of what I tend to define as ‘proud Jewish self-hatred.’”

Atzmon is only half joking. The objective moment at the heart of this parody is the slow spread of disillusionment with Zionism among Israelis. At the very moment when Israel through proxies like AIPAC rules the world, the Jews they claim to speak for are undergoing a moment of deep disillusionment. Gilad Atzmon, the Israeli musician who has nominated himself as the spokesman for the proud, self-hating Jew, believes “that it is the proud SHJs that will bring Israeli Zionism and even global Zionism

down.”

Having been born an Israeli, Atzmon had been subjected to Zionist propaganda for his entire life. He fought in the army, and then one day he woke up and didn’t believe it anymore.

The very program that worked so well and still works at large in the instance of my former fellow countrymen failed in my case. Not only had I stopped loving myself, I somehow failed to hate the Goyim. This is when I realized for the first time that actually there was no anti-Semitism around. Somehow, when I stopped loving myself, I also started to suspect the entire official Jewish historical narrative, both the Zionist one as well as the biblical one. How to say it, it didn’t take long before I started to question the official Zionist Holocaust tale.

Belief in Zionism, like belief in Communism, was an all or nothing proposition. Once the first doubt took root in Atzmon’s mind the entire edifice was doomed to collapse. The first thing Atzmon doubted was that dogma that “Jew-hating is an irrational act of madness or some backward Christian tendency.” Unlike Ruth Wisse, who articulated one of the dogmas

of contemporary Judaism when she claimed that “anti-Semitism is not directed against the behavior of Jews but against the existence of Jews,” Gilad Atzmon began to entertain “the possibility that anti-Jewish feelings may come as a response or even retaliation to Jewish acts.” In fact, he continued, “Zionism is maintained by anti-Semitism. Without anti-Semitism there is no need for a Jewish State and without the Holocaust there wouldn’t even be a Jewish State.”

According to Atzmon, Jewish organizations like AIPAC and the ADL “are all remarkably good in generating hatred against Jews.” That hatred in turn generates fear and fear is what keeps the average Jew in bondage to the synagogue of Satan. During the course of his soliloquy, Atzmon concludes that as a proud, self-hating Jew he hates neither Jews nor Judaism, which he defines in ethnic terms. His quarrel is with what he calls “Jewishness,

> . . . the supremacist tendency that draws its force from a materialist secularized misinterpretation of the Judaic code. It is Jewishness rather than Judaism that fuels Zionism with murderous zeal.”

What Atzmon calls “Jewishness” is what Nicholas Donin and Joseph

Pfefferkorn and the Fathers Lemann would have called the Talmud, which is to say, the racist, messianic ideology that has been the main engine driving revolutionary Jews throughout history. Many Jews have had this experience. They wake up one day and realize that their ethnic group has been colonized by some dark evil force for centuries. The name of that evil is the Talmud. The Talmud is the constitution for the synagogue of Satan, the cabal which had ruled Jews through fear for 2000 years.

Atzmon isn't alone in feeling disillusionment with Zionism. Yuri Slezkine also says that "The Zionist revolution is over":

> The original ethos of youthful athleticism, belligerence, and single mindedness is carried on by a tired elite of old generals. Half a century after its founding, Israel bears a distant family resemblance to the Soviet Union half a century after the October Revolution. The last representatives of the first Sabra generation are sill in power, but their days are numbered (p. 367).

The rhetoric of racial superiority is hopelessly outdated, even when surrounded by the window-dressing of holocaust

victimhood. Holocaust culture postponed the final reckoning, but by the beginning of the 21st century it had become clear that "The rhetoric of ethnic homogeneity and ethnic deportations, tabooed elsewhere in the west, is a routine element of Israeli political life." The realization arrives half-way through Steven Spielberg's film *Munich*, when the Jewish toy maker turned bomb maker tells Avner Kauffman, "Jews don't do wrong because our enemies do wrong . . . . We're supposed to be righteous." During the course of *Munich*, Aver Kauffman comes to the realization I have already mentioned, the same one which turned Gilad Atzmon into a proud, self-hating Jew.

At this point it is not clear whether the proud, self-hating Jew can leverage his disillusionment with Zionism into an escape from the dialectic of Jewish history with its regular cycle of enthusiasm followed by disillusionment followed by enthusiasm for a new Messiah. The objective moment here involves an understanding of what Atzmon calls "Jewishness." Jewishness is not just another version of ethnicity like Irishness or Polishness. "Jewishness" is an ideology. It is a Talmudic deformation of

Logos that has caused suffering, largely in the form of revolution,
throughout the last 2000 years of history.

The Catholic Church has always condemned anti-Semitism because
Anti-Semitism, which is to say, hatred of the Jewish race, is wrong in and
of itself. But beyond that anti-Semitism is also an inappropriate response
to what Atzmon calls “Jewishness.” Anti-Semitism is in many ways a
competing form of “Jewishness.” Anti-Semitism cannot deal with
“Jewishness,” because a Jew is not someone with Abraham’s DNA in his
cells. Most Jews aren’t even Semites. The Jew, insofar as he appropriates
his “Jewishness,” is a theological construct. He is a rejecter of Christ.
The Talmud was created to keep the Jewish people in bondage to a
leadership that has existed under various manifestations throughout
history—the Sanhedrin, the Kahal, the Politburo, the ADL, AIPAC. Each of
these groups has proposed a false messiah as the antidote and alternative
to the true Messiah, and each has led either to violent reaction or
equally violent disappointment throughout history. In the 20 years
following 1648, the entire cycle played itself out. The Chmielnicki

pogroms and Shabbetai Zevi were reaction, Messiah, disappointment.

There is some indication that the same thing is happening again. Sixty years ago, the Communist empire spread across the face of the earth, and yet at the same time the Jews who had supported Stalin so faithfully began to experience widespread disillusionment with Communism. The same thing is now happening to Zionism, at the very moment when the Israel Lobby has reached the pinnacle of worldly power.

If this is the case, what are the options at the present moment? In one of his more cryptic moments, Atzmon claims that “Salvation is the Masada of the Proud, Self-Hating Jew.” Atzmon is referring to the mass suicide which followed the 70 AD insurrection against Rome which eventuated in the destruction of the Temple. The 21st century version of Masada would be much more dramatic because today’s despairing Zionists have nuclear weapons, a fact which lends new urgency to dissuading the Jews from taking the whole world with them when they go through one of their inevitable periods of disillusionment.

The other option is conversion, the option which has always

been there since the beginning. This means conversion to Logos in all of its forms, from philosophical realism and the tenets of onto-theology to acceptance of Jesus Christ as the one and only Messiah. It also means an equally firm rejection of all forms of Talmudic deception, including sexual liberation, racism, messianic politics, and deconstruction.

The Catholic Church, which throughout its history has urged the conversion of the Jews, has thus far been incapable of lending assistance in this regard because it has been lamed by an interpretation of Nostra Aetate which contradicts the Gospels. One of the rituals of post-Nostra Aetate ecumenism which has developed over the past 40 years entails having some church dignitary stand up at an ecumenical gathering—after the Jews have denounced the Church as the font of all anti-Semitism and the immediate cause of Hitler's genocide—and announce that the Jews do not need Christ as their savior. In May 2001, at a meeting of the international Catholic-Jewish Liaison committee in New York, Walter Cardinal Kasper, the Vatican official in charge of the Church's relations with the Jews, tried to quell the Jewish discomfort caused by the issuance of the

Congregation
for the Doctrine of the Faith's *Dominus Iesus* on the Unicity and Salvific
Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church by claiming that "God's
grace, which is the grace of Jesus Christ according to our faith, is
available to all. Therefore the Church believes that Judaism, i.e., the
faithful response of the Jewish people to God's irrevocable covenant is
salvific *for them*, because God is faithful to his promises" (emphasis
added).

In placating the Jews, Kasper not only contradicted the Gospels and 2000
years of Church teaching, he also contradicted the recently issued *Dominus*
Iesus, which claimed that

> There is only one salvific economy of the one and triune God realized in
> the mystery of the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Son of God,
> actualized with the cooperation of the Holy Spirit and extended in its
> salvific value to all humanity and to the entire universe. "No one,
> therefore, can enter into communion with God except through Christ by the
> working of the Holy Spirit."

Kasper also contradicted Pope John Paul II's 1990

encyclical Redemptoris
Missio, which claimed that

> Christ is the one Savior of all, the only one able to reveal God and lead
> to God. In reply to the Jewish religious authorities who question the
> apostles about healing the lame man, Peter says: “By the name of Jesus
> Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by
> him this man is standing before you well . . .And there is salvation in no
> one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which
> we must be saved.” . . . salvation can only come from Jesus Christ.

In attempting to extricate himself from hot water, Kasper only made
matters worse by muddying the already muddy waters even more. In November
2002, Cardinal Kasper gave a speech at Boston College in which he claimed
that Jews could be saved if they “follow their own conscience and believe
in God’s promises as they understand them in their religious tradition,
they are in line with God’s plan, which *for us* comes to historical
completion in Jesus Christ” (my emphasis).

In using the phrase “for us,” Kasper implied that there were two ways to

salvation, a clear contradiction of the Gospels and recent Vatican pronouncement like *Dominus Iesus*. Kasper, however, was not alone in making these heretical claims. In August 2002, the US Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and interreligious Affairs, under the direction of William Cardinal Keeler, along with the US National Council of Synagogues issued a paper entitled, "Reflections on Covenant and Mission," which claimed that:

"A deepening Catholic appreciation of the eternal covenant between God and the Jewish people, together with a recognition of a divinely given mission to the Jews to witness to God's faithful love, lead to the conclusion that campaigns that target Jews for conversion to Christianity are no longer theologically acceptable in the Catholic Church."

Once the heretical nature of statements like that became apparent, Cardinal Keeler tried to control the damage by claiming that the covenant and Mission statement that the USCCB Committee had released did not constitute any kind of formal position on the part of the US bishops, but rather merely represented "the state of thought among participants" in the dialogue "between Catholics and Jews." As some indication

that Rome
agreed, the paper was never promulgated as an official document of the
United States Bishops' conference.

Deep Crisis

But the fact that it got written at all gave some indication that Nostra
Aetate had led to a deep crisis in the Catholic Church. In order to
participate in ecumenical dialogue with Jews, Catholic "experts" had to be
willing to make heretical statements which contradicted the teaching of
the Catholic Church. They had to be willing to deny fundamental tenets of
Catholic theology. The Church was suddenly in a position where she could
not articulate a coherent position because denial of the Gospel had become
the condition sine qua non of dialogue with the Jews.

In many ways, this problem went all the way to the top. Viewing the
history of Pope John Paul II's relations with the Jews, one of the most
ultramontane of American Catholic commentators was forced to conclude that
"Even Pope John Paul II . . . could occasionally create the impression
that the Church was perhaps now prepared to cut a few corners in the
interests of better relations" with the Jews. In the

“Declaration on the Relation of the Church with Judaism,” delivered to a Jewish group in Mainz, Germany, in 1980, “John Paul II,” according to the same commentator, “actually made the remark that the old covenant with the Jews had in fact ‘never been revoked by God.’” The statement was theologically defensible because God never revoked the covenants with Noah or Abraham, but it gave the impression that the “new and everlasting covenant” which Christ Himself established did not apply to the Jews.

Pope John Paul II’s gestures were even worse in this regard. His prayer at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem was theatrical but ambiguous. Jews who pray at the Wailing Wall pray for the restoration of the Temple. No pope could ever contemplate doing what would be a completely wicked act, but Jewish artists lost no time memorializing that act and all of the ambiguity it embodied as a way of justifying their call for a ban on all forms of “proselytism.” It is no wonder then that people like Roy Schoeman are confused. Schoeman is a Jewish convert to Catholicism who thinks the end times have arrived. As a Catholic Schoeman now looks forward to the restoration of the Temple without understanding that if that

were to
happen it would be tantamount to the abomination of desolation spoken of
in Revelation and not the second coming.

The idea of the Jews converting at the pinnacle of their worldly power is
implausible unless looked at from a theological perspective, but since the
premise of our argument is that the Jew is an essentially theological
construct, that is precisely how we should view the issue. To begin with,
the synagogue of Satan needs to be viewed as the antithesis of the Church.
So, if Christians, following the example of St. Paul can say, “when I am
weak, then I am strong,” the synagogue of Satan would have to say the
exact opposite, namely, “when I am strong, then I am weak.” And that
admission corresponds uncannily to the psychological phenomenon of the
“proud, self-hating Jew” which we have been discussing.

The final collapse of Jewish resistance to Logos will have to take place
when they have reached the pinnacle of worldly power. We have no way of
knowing what the future will bring, but we can say with confidence that at
no time in the history of the past 2000 years have Jews had more power
than they hold at the present moment. The fact that the

Jews are now in
full possession of Jerusalem and, according to some reports, planning to
rebuild the temple, lends credence to the belief that the stage is being
set for that last great battle over who will rule over the Jewish soul.

Fr. Augustin Lemann, himself a Jewish convert, feels that the future
conversion of the Jewish people is certain. He bases this on the testimony
of many Church Fathers. “There is a well-known tradition cherished by the
faithful,” writes St. Augustine, “that in the last days before the
Judgment, the great and admirable Prophet Elias is to explain the law to
the Jews and to lead them to the acceptance of the True Messias Our
Christ” (Denis Fahey, The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the
Jewish Nation, p. 101). Then “These carnal Israelites,” Augustine
continues, “who today refuse to believe in Jesus Christ, will one day
believe in Him . . . Osee foretells their conversion in the following
terms: ‘The children of Israel shall sit many days without king and
without prince and without sacrifice, and without altar and without ephod
and without theraphim.” “Who is there,” Denis Fahey interjects, “who does
not see in this a portrait of the present state of the Jewish

people” (p.
101-2).

Augustine is not alone in his belief that the Jews will at some point close to the culmination of human history convert. St. Thomas Aquinas claims that “as by the fall of the Jews, the Gentiles who had been enemies were reconciled, so after the conversion of the Jews near the end of the world, there will be a general resurrection by which men will rise from the dead to immortal life.” (p. 105). According to Father Augustin Lemann,

> The prophet Elias then shall return upon the earth to bring back the Jews to the Savior. Our Lord Himself has clearly affirmed it (Matt: XVII, II).
>
> . . The fathers are the patriarchs and all the pious ancestors of the Jewish people, the sons represent the degenerate race of the time of Our Lord Jesus Christ and of the succeeding centuries. It is however only some time before the second coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ, before the dreadful day of the Divine Judgment dawns that our Savior will send the prophet Elias to the Jews to convert them and to save them from chastisement.

St. Paul claims that this conversion will only take place at the end of time, and that until that time, the Jews will continue "to fill up their sins always: for the wrath of God is come upon them to the end." St. Jerome also believes that the Jews will convert at the end of the world when they will "find themselves in dazzling light, as if Our Lord were returning to them from Egypt. . . ." According to Suarez, "The conversion of the Jews will take place at the approach of the Last Judgment and at the height of the persecution which Antichrist will inflict on the Church." The Jews will, according to all accounts, continue to express their hostility to Christ until the moment of their conversion. The conversion will be dramatic and in the last time Christians will resemble the Jews "because of our sins, in fact they will be worse." In this regard, Origen supports the contention of Yuri Slezkine in his claim that modernity is Jewish. St. John Chrysostom claims that "God will recall the Jews a second time," when the Christians have abandoned the faith. Jews will become Christians when Christians will have become Jews.

The Antichrist will be a Jew

At that point of apostasy, the Antichrist will appear, and he will be a Jew, who, according to Suarez, will find “his chief support among the Jews.” He will also “restore the city of their ancestors and its temple in which they have always taken a special pride” because if he did not, he could not “get himself accepted as the Messias by the Jews who dream of earthly glory for Jerusalem and imagine that that city will become the capital of the future Messianic kingdom.” If Suarez could have been catapulted into the future to contemplate the state of the state of Israel in 2006, he might well conclude that the end times were at hand. If he read Gilad Atzmon’s website, he might conclude that the conversion of the Jews was at hand as well. The unprecedented strength of the Jews, coupled with the unprecedented weakness of the Church, allows nothing but apocalyptic explanations.

At the culmination of history, the Jewish antichrist will be strong, stronger than he has ever been in history, and the Church will be weak, weaker than she has ever been in history. At that moment, the Messianic

kingdom of heaven on earth, the kingdom of maximal wealth and power for the Jews (and maximal misery for everyone else) will be at hand and all that the synagogue of Satan has longed for for centuries will seem to be within its grasp. At that point, the Jews will have a choice forced upon them, and, according to Christian tradition, many will choose Christ. Why they would do that then is easy enough to explain. Rabbi Dresner does so in his book on the plight of the American family which is really a tract on the plight of American Jews, who

> in their search for passion and pleasure and power, have lost themselves in the kingdom of Caesar. Is it not ironic that the descendants of those who wrote the Psalms and offered prayer to the world became, according to all accountings, the least worshipful. . . . The chosen people seemed to flatten into normality, becoming what the prophets had warned against: "like the nations." . . . Many postmodern Jews have discovered a puzzling truth. No license has replaced the Law; no symphony, the Psalms, no chandelier, the Sabbath candles; no opera, Yom Kippur; no country club, the synagogue; no mansion, the home; no Jaguar, a child; no mistress, a

wife; no banquet, the Passover seder; no towering metropolis, Jerusalem;

no impulse, the joy of doing a mitzvah; no man, God. (p. 329).

At the heart of Rabbi Dresner's panegyric on American Jews, we uncover the psychological mechanism that will lead to their conversion. When they are strong, they are weak. Alan Dershowitz has said something similar about Jewish demographics in America in his book The Vanishing American Jew. The more wealth and power the Jews accumulate the weaker they become because becoming rich has deprived the Jew of one of his most perduring illusions, namely, that Tevye would be happy "if I were a rich man." Tevye's grandchildren are, as Rabbi Dresner indicates, far richer than Tevye could have imagined, but in becoming rich and powerful they ended up being "proud, self-hating Jews." Money is, in many ways, the least important issue here. As Rabbi Dresner indicates darkly, "Jews have tried all things." After having "exhausted modernity," Jews now "seek the recovery of the sacred" (p. 330).

What Rabbi Dresner failed to understand is that the sacred cannot be recovered by performing outmoded rites. Jews cannot find

the sacred among
the dead. They can only find it among the living. The Church can
capitalize on this moment and save the world from Masada with nuclear
weapons but only if it reasserts its traditional position on the Jews.
That means “Sicut Iudeis non . . . “ which states that no one may harm the
Jew or disturb his worship, but that Christians have an equally solemn
duty to prevent Jewish subversion of faith and morals. That means that the
Church should condemn anti—Semitism, which means “hatred of the Jews as a
race,” but, by the same token the Church should not allow the Jews to
define the term for her, because in that instance the Jews will use “the
word to designate any form of opposition to themselves” and their infernal
project of cultural subversion. According to the Jewish definition of the
term, “anyone who opposes Jewish pretensions is more or less mentally
deranged.”

Balancing Act

The Church has never in its history been anti-Semitic. Traditional
Catholic teaching on the Jews has always involved a delicate balancing
act:

On the one hand, the Church has spoken for the Jews to protect their persons and their worship against unjust attacks . . . On the other hand, the Church has spoken against the Jews, when they wanted to impose their yoke on the faithful and provoke apostasy. She has always striven to protect the faithful from contamination by them. As experience in past centuries showed, if the Jews succeeded in attaining to high offices of State they would abuse their powers to the detriment of Catholics, the church always strove to prevent Catholics from coming under their yoke. They were forbidden to proselytize and were not allowed to have Christians as slaves or servants" (Fahey, p. 80).

At the darkest hour of Nazi persecution during the '30s, Pope Pius XI defended the Jews from their persecutors by proclaiming that "anti-Semitism is inadmissible. We are spiritually Semites." Less well known is the rest of what he had to say. After affirming that it was "impossible for Christians to be Anti-Semites," Pope Pius XI went on to say that "we acknowledge that everyone has the right to defend himself, in other words to take the necessary precautions for his

protection against
everything that threatens his legitimate interests.”

In giving his gloss on Pius XI’s speech, Denis Fahey simply reiterates
what the church has always proclaimed in the statements on the Jews known
as “Sicut Iudeis non . . .”:

> On the one hand, the Sovereign Pontiffs strive to protect the Jews from
> physical violence and to secure respect for their family life and their
> worship, as the life and worship of human persons. On the other hand, they
> aim unceasingly at protecting Christians from the contamination of Jewish
> Naturalism and try to prevent Jews from obtaining control over Christians.
> The existence of the second needs to be strongly stressed because to some
> extent it has been lost sight of in recent times. Catholics need to be
> made familiar, not only with the repeated Papal condemnations of the
> Talmud, but with the measures taken by the Sovereign Pontiffs to preserve
> society from the inroads of Jewish naturalism. Otherwise they will be
> exposed to the risk of speaking of Pope St. Pius V and Pope Benedict XIV,
> for example as Anti-Semites. . . . .

Opposition to Jewish ambition “to impose its rule on other

nations” is not
anti-Semitism, even if the Jews want to portray it that way. The Christian
must oppose anti-Semitism, defined as hatred of the Jewish race, but he
must also oppose the Jewish agenda of opposition to Logos. As many
Catholics have done in the past, the Catholic must oppose the agenda of
the revolutionary Jew, even now—nay, especially now—when Jews have
adopted the tropes of conservatism to disguise their true aims.

St. Pope Pius X felt that the endtimes had arrived in 1903. And in a sense
he was right, by the time the dust had settled after World War I, all of
Europe’s remaining Catholic empires had been toppled and the Jewish
communist antichrist had been placed on the vacant throne of Russia’s
Christian Czar. Perhaps Pius X had a vision of the future when he wrote on
October 4, 1903 that

> Whosoever weighs these things has certainly reason to fear that such
> perversion of mind may herald the evils announced for the end of time and
> as it were, the beginning of those calamities and that the son of
> perdition of whom the Apostle speaks may have already made his appearance

here below. So great are the fury and hatred with which religion is
everywhere assailed, that it seems to be a determined effort to destroy
every vestige of the relation between God and man. On the other hand — and
this is, according to the same Apostle, the special characteristic of
Antichrist—with frightful presumption man is attempting to usurp the place
of his Creator and is lifting himself above all that is called God. . .
is dedicating the visible world to himself as a temple, in which he has
the pretension to receive the adoration of his fellow men. 'So that he
sitteth in the temple of God showing himself as if he were God'" (II
Thess, II, 4). (p. 177).

As John the Evangelist has written, there are "many Antichrists" (I John
II, 18), and the Jews have welcomed all of them. "Down the centuries,"
writes Father Lemann, "the Jews have welcomed all the enemies of Jesus
Christ and his Church and have constituted themselves their auxiliaries.
In the Great Sanhedrin, held at Paris in 1807, they applied the Biblical
titles, exclusively reserved to the Messias to Napoleon, though Napoleon
was not of Jewish blood. They even welcomed the principles of the French

Revolution as the Messias: “The Messias came for us on Feb. 28, 1790, with the Declaration of the Rights of Man.’” (p. 187).

Inspired by Pius X’s statement Msgr. Robert Hugh Benson wrote *Lord of the World*, a novel which appeared in 1907 but which was set in the early 21st century, roughly 100 years in the future, which is to say in 2007. In that novel a weakened English pope confronts an antichrist with the iconic name of Julian Felsenburgh on the plains of Megiddo.

In June of 2006 Pope Benedict XVI announced that he was going to Megiddo in 2007. Megiddo is another word for Armageddon. The apocalyptic aura of his visit was overshadowed by the apocalyptic nature of the age. George Bush, like the antichrist Julian the Apostate was locked in an unwinnable war in Iraq and threatening to extend that war to the east by dropping nuclear weapons on Iran. Judging from appearances, the conversion of the Jews did not seem imminent. The Jews had never been more powerful; the Church was weak. But appearances can be deceiving. Benedict XVI was the author of *Dominus Iesus* and had said, even before becoming pope, that he was looking forward to the conversion of the Jews. Reversal was in the

air.

E. Michael Jones is editor of Culture Wars.

Culture Wars • 206 Marquette Avenue • South Bend, IN 46617 • Tel: (574) 289-9786
• Fax: (574) 289-1461
Copyright